



---

## Public Meeting No. 2

---

### MINIDOKA NORTH SIDE RESOURCE MANAGEMENT PLAN

---

#### **Summary Memo** *Meeting Date: March 20, 2003*

#### **INTRODUCTION AND PLANNING TEAM PRESENTATION**

This document is a summary of the second public meeting for the Minidoka North Side Resource Management Plan (RMP), held March 20, 2003, in Burley, Idaho. The meeting date and time were published in a newsbrief that was sent out to a mailing list with approximately 300 names. It was also sent to various news organizations to place in their respective media.

The purpose of this summary is to note the topics and issues discussed at the meeting. The main goals of the meeting were to review what had occurred since the 1<sup>st</sup> public meeting, present the overall planning process, describe the Draft Goals and Objectives, and review and get input on the Draft Alternatives.

After a brief welcome from Chris Ketchum, John Petrovsky started the meeting off by providing an overview of the agenda, including a brief explanation of the materials available as handouts. He then went into a PowerPoint presentation that lasted approximately 40 minutes. The presentation covered the planning process and schedule of events (tasks), Draft Goals and Objectives, Draft RMP Alternatives, and an explanation of how the breakout groups exercise (workshop) would work. He ended the presentation by taking some questions from the audience.

#### **DRAFT ALTERNATIVES WORKSHOP**

The public was asked to provide input on the alternatives in four ways:

1. A table with all the alternatives was put up on the wall at two separate stations. Each station had about 4 – 6 participants. After a brief reiteration about the alternatives and the process by which we were seeking to get public input, each participant was given several minutes to review and mark up handout versions of the Draft Alternatives table.
2. Each participant was then encouraged to speak about what alternatives or concepts they prefer and why. These comments were recorded on a flipchart and briefly discussed by the group.
3. All members of the public at each breakout group was then given a marker and the option of making one checkmark next to the part of the alternative they prefer. This was done to help

Reclamation see where the participating public was on the various options and help in refining the alternatives and then selecting a preferred alternative.

4. Finally, it was noted that additional written comments could be provided to Carolyn Burpee Stone by Friday, March 28, 2003.

#### **WRAP-UP**

John Petrovsky concluded the meeting by calling both groups back together and providing a summary of the key findings from the marked up, wall-sized Alternatives tables. He noted that the main points from each group was continued/increased protection of natural resource values (wildlife, habitat, water quality, etc.) while providing for more multiple use of the parcels (grazing, agriculture, access, etc.). He observed that, while not entirely mutually exclusive, these two main goals represent a challenge to Reclamation in striking a balanced approach at managing the Minidoka North Side lands and at the same time attempting to meet public desires.

- *END* -